

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-33 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-3 and 5-33 are amended.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

The undersigned appreciates the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the September 16 personal interview with Examiner Chung. The substance of the interview is discussed in the remarks below.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kawasaki (U.S. Patent No. 4,246,578), Ying (U.S. Patent No. 4,057,849) and Rossmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,670) and further in view of Matthews (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,708). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither Kawasaki, Ying, Rossmann nor Matthews, individually or in combination, disclose or even suggest a telecommunication device where a display unit, a display control means, an operating unit and an informing means are integrated into the telecommunication device and the telecommunication device is wearable on a user, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 3, 29 and 30.

Further, none of the applied references disclose or even suggest a telecommunication device where a display unit, a display control means and an operating unit are integrated into the telecommunication device and the telecommunication device is wearable on a user, as recited in independent claim 9.

Furthermore, none of the applied references disclose or even suggest a telecommunication device is wearable on a user, as recited in independent claims 31 and 32.

As a preliminary matter, none of the applied references above disclose or even suggest a telecommunication device which is wearable on the user. Kawasaki pertains to a pattern generation display system that uses a CRT tube (see col. 1, lines 1-7 of Kawasaki). Ying discloses a text editing and display system that also uses a CRT tube (see Abstract of Ying). Rossmann discloses a method of displaying elements in a display screen of pocket size devices (see col. 1, lines 13-22), however, does not disclose that the pocket size devices are wearable on the user. Matthews discloses a system for displaying a list on a display screen, such as in a cable television system (see Abstract of Matthews and col. 1, lines 11-18). As such, none of the applied references disclose or even suggest the features of the claimed invention, as above.

Further, neither Kawasaki, Ying, Rossmann nor Matthews, individually or in combination, disclose or even suggest a telecommunication device including at least display control means that causes a new line of characters to be started whenever it would otherwise be required to break a word across two lines of a plurality of lines of characters of information, and displaying the plurality of characters of the information on a display unit, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 29 and 31.

The Office Action admits that Kawasaki does not disclose the features of claims 1, 29 and 31. Ying merely discloses fetching a line of characters from memory, one character at a time and storing them in a shift register. As each character is loaded into the shift register, control bits associated with a character are examined to determine whether the character is a

space or hyphen, for example. If it is, then both the position of the character and the shift register, and address of the character and memory are noted. When the first character that would cause a spillover beyond the right hand margin is loaded, the loading is terminated. A display controller blanks the character positions in the line following the position of the last word-ending or word-break word prior to spillover (see, for example, col. 2, lines 12-33).

As such, Ying does not disclose or even suggest causing a new line of characters to be started whenever it would otherwise be required to break a word across two lines of a plurality of lines of characters of the information.

Rossmann, in Figs. 4a-4d, discloses that when the length of each of the elements 410-413 exceeds the screen display width, the display of each element is clipped and only as many characters of each element that fit the screen display are visible. As such, Rossmann does not disclose or even suggest the features of claims 1, 29 and 31.

Matthews discloses a system for displaying a list of items where one item in the list is displayed in its entirety and one or more items are partially displayed to give the user an indication that the list extends beyond the borders of the list (see Abstract of Matthews). As such, Matthews does not disclose or even suggest the features of claim 1, 29 and 31.

Furthermore, neither Kawasaki, Ying, Rossmann nor Matthews, individually or in combination, disclose or even suggest a telecommunication device including at least control display control means that causes the display unit to automatically form a vertical scrolling display a plurality of times continuously when an amount of information to be displayed exceeds a number of lines displayable on the display unit in one frame, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 3, 9, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

The Office Action admits that Kawasaki does not disclose or even suggest automatically forming a vertical scrolling display a plurality of times continuously when an

amount of information to be displayed exceeds a number of lines displayable on the display unit in one frame, as in claims 1, 3, 9, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

Rossmann does not compensate for the above-noted deficiencies of Kawasaki. Instead, Rossmann that the displayed text can be automatically scrolled vertically. However, Rossmann discourages using this method because automatic scrolling of display makes it harder for the user to remember choices presented to the user (see col., 2, lines 3-24). The claimed invention solves this problem by automatically forming a vertical scrolling display a plurality of times continuously. Thus, Rossmann does not disclose or even suggest the features of claims 1, 3, 9, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

Further, as discussed above, Ying merely describes a text editing system using a CRT, where a display controller blanks a character position in the line following the position of a word-ending or word-break word so that the next display line begins with this character. Rossmann merely discloses a selection method where the length of each elements 410-413 that exceeds the width of the screen display is clipped. Matthews merely discloses in a display system for a cable television system, an item is fully displayed in its entirety in the display, and one or more items are partially displayed to give the user an indication that the list extends beyond the borders of the list. As such, none of the applied references disclose or even suggest the features of claims 1, 3, 9, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 3, 9 and 29-32 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2, 5-28 and 33 depend from the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-33 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/dmw

Date: September 25, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--